

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-35 were pending in the application. Claims 1-35 have been amended, leaving Claims 1-35 for consideration upon entry of the present amendment. The specification has been amended to correct informality. No new matter added by the amendment.

***Specification Objection***

The disclosure was objected to because of the informalities on page 14, lines 11-12 of the specification.

The specification has been amended to delete the "if a reader desires a more detailed explanation of the Universal Call Control System, the reader is directed to U.S. Patent Application No. \_\_\_\_\_, filed \_\_\_\_\_, and incorporated herein by reference in its entirety" of page 14, lines 10-12 of the specification.

Withdrawal of the specification objection is respectfully requested.

***Claim Objections***

Claims 1-35 were objected to for informalities.

Claim numbers "[c01]-[c35]" in claims 1-35 have been corrected to "1-35", as suggested by the Examiner.

Withdrawal of the claim objections is respectfully requested.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103*****Claims 1-11, 15-16 and 18-26**

Claims 1-11, 15-16 and 18-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kay et al., US 5,754,634 (hereinafter "Kay") in view of Jagadish et al., US 6,058,170 (hereinafter "Jagadish") for the reasons stated on pages 3-10 of the Office Action.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was

made. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, a method for providing a usage pattern for a customer of a telecommunications system, the usage pattern providing historical information concerning the customer's use of the telecommunications system, comprising causing the historical information of the usage pattern to be compared with a predetermined billing plan, whereby the customer uses the computer device to access the usage pattern and controls the use of the telecommunications system based on a comparison result. Support for the amendment can be found on page 3, lines 6-10 or page 13, lines 3-5 of the specification.

The method of claim 1 provides the usage pattern having the information on the customer's use of the telecommunications system, and compares the historical information of the usage pattern with a predetermined billing plan. Based on the comparison result, a customer controls the use of the telecommunications system. For example, if the comparison result states that the customer uses the telecommunications system over the billing plan, the customer reduces the use of the telecommunications system by reducing current use of the telecommunications system or preventing unknown use of the telecommunications system.

On the contrary, Kay discloses a method and system for tracking call transaction data from incoming telephone calls, including attempted calls that have not been completed during a specified time period. Kay focuses on providing means for determining total incoming call volume or the times and places at which the calls are most frequently placed to an advertising subscriber, rather than controlling the use of the telephone calls. Thus, Kay neither teaches nor suggests "causing the historical information of the usage pattern to be compared with a predetermined billing plan, whereby the customer uses the computer device to access the usage pattern and controls the use of the telecommunications system based on a comparison result", as claimed in claim 1.

Jagadish discloses a method and system for automatically generating telephone bills that include customer defined or requested summary information. Jagadish simply

discloses generating the telephone bill automatically by accumulating summary information as each individual call record is received and rated in real-time, but does not teach or suggest comparing the summary information with a predetermined billing plan to control the use of the telephone call. Thus, Jagadish does not cure the deficiency of Kay.

Both Kay and Jagadish do not concern using summary information after generated and controlling the customer's use of the telecommunications system based on the comparison of the summary information and a predetermined billing plan. Thus, there is no motivation to modify Kay in view of Jagadish to arrive at the invention of claim 1. Accordingly, the combination of Kay and Jagadish does not render obvious claim 1.

Claim 15 has been amended to recite a method for providing a usage pattern for a customer of a telecommunication system, the usage pattern providing historical information concerning the customer's use of the telecommunications system, comprising causing the historical information of the usage pattern to be compared with a predetermined billing plan, whereby the customer uses the device to access the usage pattern and controls the use of the telecommunications system based on a comparison result.

Claim 15 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1.

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1, and claims 16 and 18-26 depend from claim 15. Claims 2-11, 16 and 18-26 are believed to be allowable due to their dependency on claims 1 and 15.

Claims 12 and 27

Claims 12 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kay in view of Jagadish further in view of Hill, US 5,953,398 (hereinafter "Hill") for the reasons stated on page 11 of the Office Action.

Hill discloses long distance telephone services capable of issuing and/or recharging prepaid long distance telephone accounts from remote locations. Although Hill discloses announcing to a user the balance remaining on the user's account number, Hill neither teaches nor suggests causing the remaining balance to be compared with a predetermined billing plan, thereby controlling the use of the long distance telephone based on the comparison result. Thus, Hill does not cure the deficiencies of Kay and

Jagadish.

Accordingly, the combination of Kay, Jagadish and Hill does not render claims 1 and 15 obvious. Claim 12 depends from claim 1, and claim 27 depends from claim 15. Claims 12 and 27 are believed to be allowable due to their dependency on claims 1 and 15.

Claims 13, 17 and 28

Claims 13, 17 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kay in view of Jagadish further in view of Wang et al., US 6,161,134 (hereinafter "Wang") for the reasons stated on pages 11-13 of the Office Action.

Wang discloses an information appliance and a network appliance that function independently as well as with each other. There is no teaching or suggestion, in Wang, of controlling a customer's use of a telecommunications system by comparing the historical information of the usage pattern with a predetermined billing plan. Thus, Wang does not cure the deficiencies of Kay and Jagadish.

Accordingly, the combination of Kay, Jagadish and Wang does not render obvious claims 1 and 15. Claim 13 depends from claim 1, and claims 17 and 28 depend from claim 15. Claims 13, 17 and 28 are believed to be allowable due to their dependency on claims 1 and 15.

Claims 14 and 29-35

Claims 14 and 29-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kay in view of Jagadish further in view of Wang and Hill for the reasons stated on pages 13-17 of the Office Action.

Claim 14 has been amended to recite a method for providing a usage pattern for a subscriber of a telecommunications system, the usage pattern providing information concerning the subscriber's use of the telecommunications system, comprising causing the acquired usage pattern to be compared with a predetermined billing plan of the billing cycle, whereby the customer uses the computer device to access the usage pattern and controls the use of the telecommunications system based on a comparison result.

Claim 29 has been amended to recite a method for providing a usage pattern for a customer of a telecommunications system, the usage pattern providing historical information concerning the customer's use of the telecommunications system, comprising

causing the historical information of the usage pattern to be compared with a predetermined billing plan of the billing cycle, whereby the customer uses the device to access the usage pattern and controls the use of the telecommunications system based on a comparison result.

Claim 30 has been amended to recite a method of acquiring a usage pattern for a customer of a telecommunications system, the usage pattern providing historical information concerning the customer's use of the telecommunications system, comprising comparing the historical information of the usage pattern with a predetermined billing plan of the billing cycle, wherein the customer controls the use of the telecommunications system based on a comparison result.

Claim 34 has been amended to recite a system for providing a usage pattern for a customer of a telecommunications system, the usage pattern providing historical information concerning the customer's use of the telecommunications system, comprising a processor accessing the database of usage patterns, acquiring the usage pattern and causing the historical information of the usage pattern to be compared with a predetermined billing plan of the billing cycle, wherein the customer controls the use of the telecommunications system based on a comparison result.

Claim 35 has been amended to recite a public switched telephone network for processing a telephone call, wherein the subscriber controls a use of the telephone call by comparing information of the usage pattern with a predetermined billing plan of the billing cycle.

As described above, any of Kay, Jagadish, Hill and Wang does not suggest or teach causing the usage pattern to be compared with a predetermined billing plan, whereby the customer uses the device to access the usage pattern and controls the use of the telecommunications system based on a comparison result.

Thus, the combination of Kay, Jagadish, Hill and Wang does not render obvious claims 14, 29, 30, 34 and 35. Claims 31-33 depend from claim 30, thus believed to be allowable due to their dependency on claim 30.

***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant submits that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicant's attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox  
Registration No. 38,807  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No. 36192

Date: June 18, 2003